

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/916,610             | BARTON ET AL        |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Ronald Baum            | 2136                |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Ronald Baum.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Kevin Zilka.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 14 December 2004
**Time:** 14:00
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*102b; broadness of claims scope*

Claims discussed:

*1,9,10,18,20-24,27*


Prior art documents discussed:

*n/a*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon examiner reconsideration of applicants prior arguments in the remarks of 8/31/2004, discussed how claims 1,10,20-24 require limitations from dependent claims 9,27 (and associated similar claims, see examiner amendment). The examiner proposed appropriate changes via examiner amendment, into the claims that would sufficiently narrow the scope and distinguish the invention for allowance. Mr. Zilka obtained the approval of the applicant, and confirming examiners proposed claim changes..